my fear, as it happened in the past that this programme will again be appearing under different names. (*Interruptions*)

उपसभापति: इसी में आप भी कुछ एड कर रहे हैं? अब बहुत हो गया ...(**व्यवधान**)

There is nothing in it. The money is not coming just now. So, let us forget it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

> "That the Bill to amend the Finance (No. 2) Act, 1998, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula, and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI KADAMBUR M.R. JANARTHANAN: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The Motion was adopted

THE SALARY, ALLOWANCES AND PENSION OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1999

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, it is Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1999. Mr. Jethmalani, before you move the Bill, I have to tell you something. You see, there are two very mall amendments which have been proposed. One is to Clause 4 by Shri Lachhman Singhji. When we had this Bill before the House, by mistake or by oversight, it was not included the world "spouse/companion" should have been there. I think it was an oversight. That has to be amended. If somebody does not have a spouse, he can have a spice. The spice part of the Bill has to be put in. I am very happy that it is only the Rajya Sabha which always thinks of the spices. The Lok Sabha always forgets it. And the other amendment is by Shri Biplab Dasgupta. I think he is anti-spouse. He brought something which was again, by oversight, not included which should have been there. So, these amendments you be prepared to accept.

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दिल्ली): यह पता तो लगे, लोकसभा ने क्या किया इनके बारे में?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: लोकसभा में तो भूल गए न, स्पाउसेस को।...(**व्यवधान**).—that we have to remind them to insert it back.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Whether it is a fact that the companion is already allowed?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, it is not. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): They are eligible. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two-tier AC is allowed for companion, but not first class. The spouse is allowed in first AC.

श्री रामजी लाल (हरियाणा): स्पाउसेस का भी हुआ है, लोक सभा में।

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: मैडम, इसकी पोजीशन यह है कि मैम्बर एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में चलता है और अगर एसी सेकेंड क्लास में मैम्बर होगा तो कम्पेनियन भी, दोनों उसमें सफर कर सकते हैं। एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में अगर मैम्बर सफर करेगा तो कम्पेनियन सेकेंड क्लास एसी में सफर करेगा, मगर स्पाऊस जो है वह उसके साथ फर्स्ट क्लास एसी में सफर कर सकता है। उसका रीजन यह बताया गया कि नंबर इतना कम है एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में कि अगर हर कम्पेनियन को एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में जाने की इजाजत दी गई तो बहुत से मैम्बर्स को जगह ही नहीं मिल पाएगी। इसलिए इसमें स्पाऊस तक ही सिमित किया जाए।... (**व्यवधान**)... स्पाऊस साथ हो तो बुरा लगता है अलग चले।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री लछमन सिंह (हरियाणा): मैडम, ...(**व्यवधान**).

उपसभापति: घबराइए नहीं, जो आपकी समस्या है, उसका समाधान होगा। आप बैठिए। अभी आप बैठिए।

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: इसीलिए उन्होंने स्पाऊस के लिए एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में किया था कि स्पाऊस एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में मैम्बर के साथ सफर करे और अगर कंपेनियन साथ में है तो सेकेंड एसी में सफर करे। यह कही कोई मिस्टेक से नहीं हुआ। यह उन्होंने डेलीब्रेटली, जानबूझ कर, सोच-समझ कर तय किया है। जहां तक ऐसा मेरा अंदाजा है। अब अगर यह लोक सभा में वापस

आए और फिर वहां से हो। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इस बार भी पास न हो और इसी तरह से यह रह जाए, जैसे पिछली बार हुआ। ऐसा करने के बजाय उचित यह है कि इसे पास कर लें। एक कंप्रेहेंसिव बिल का जहां तक है, तो और बहुत सी चीजे हैं, दूसियाँ, उन सब चीजों को इकट्ठा करके बाद में मिनिस्टर साहब एक बिल लाने वाले है। उस वक्त इसको जोड़ लिया जाए तो मुनासिब होगा।

डा० (श्रीमती) उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल (गुजरात): मैडम, यह बात तो ठीक नहीं है। मर्दों ने अपना ही सोचा।

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: नहीं, नहीं। ऐसी बात नहीं है। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no need to react to a Member immediately even before she opens her mouth. It think it is not a very healthy practice. Let us see what she wants to say.

डा० (श्रीमती) उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल: मैडम, जो महिला अकेली है, उनके साथ किसी का एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में होना जरूरी है। खास महिलाओं के लिए यह जरूरी है कि उनके लिए कम्पेनियन एलाऊ हो। महिला किसी को अपना स्पाऊस या स्पाईस तो बता नहीं सकती है। अकेले एसी फर्स्ट क्लास में महिला का जाना भी कभी-कभी उसके लिए प्रोब्लम होता है और अगर कम्पेनियन होगा तो अच्छा रहेगा।

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: जगह नहीं है, न। ... (व्यवधान)... पति तो जाएंगे। ...(व्यवधान)...

डा० (श्रीमती) उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल: महिलाओं के लिए आपके पास जगह नहीं है। कितनी महिलाएं हैं इस पार्लियामेंट में? आप बता दीजिए। आपको हंडरेड परसेंट के लिए जगह है और महिलाओं के लिए आपके पास जगह नहीं है। यह कैसा आर्गुमेंट है?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the explanation given by the hon. Member, Malhotraji, does not get anybody's acceptance because there is no question of a third seat. The same facility which is provided to a married couple is being allowed to a single lady or a single gentleman. There are not going to be three seats. There is going to be one extra seat. A provision is being made for a spouse. If there is a single lady who wants somebody to accompany her in the train, you should not have any objection. You should not say that she should travel in the first class. Suppose, as Smt. Urmilaben said, a single lady is travelling in the first class and another woman is accompanying her. Should that woman travel alone in the second class? Just because husband and wife are travelling together, should they be treated differently? I think this is not proper. The law should be equal for everybody.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (WEST BENGAL): Just one second. There would be one technical problem. "Companion", whether that of a lady Member or that of a gentleman, has been defined in law. This facility of travelling in the first class has been extended to the Member's spouse. If you allow a companion, then, we have to create facilities for two types of companions-a companion accompanying a single lady Member and a companion accompanying a male Member or a female Member. One companion will be treated differently from the other. That will create a problem in the law itself.

Therefore, my submission to you would be this. Let this matter be examined from the legal angle. After that, if an amendment is needed, that can be done. Only one type of companion has been defined in the law. I am just concerned with the legal interpretation. A companion has been defined as a person who is accompanying a Member. "Spouse" has been defined in the law. Spouse has been permitted to travel in the A.C. first class. A companion can go along with a Member in the A.C. II tier or whatever it may be. If you allow one type of companion to travel in the A.C. first class and do not allow the other type of companion to do so, will there be any problem from the legal angle? This aspect has to be looked into. This is my submission.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I totally agree with the rationale expressed by you. But the point is, as Mr. Pranab Mukerjee has said, we want to accommodate Members who are single, and they have a practical problem. It is a practical problem. One should really sympathise with them also. But the problem is that nowadays the first class accommodation in trains is limited. So, you must find a way out to accommodate such of the Members who are single and who want to have a companion and to prevent other Members from having a companion with them. They may be males or females. There is no discrimination that way.

A spouse is a spouse, husband or wife. If a companion is going to be allowed, I feel that rather than accommodating another M.P. or his family, my companion should be there. The space that is available in the A.C. first class is very much limited.

श्री लछमन सिंह: मैडम, मेरा अमेंडमेंट है।

उपसभापति: आपके अमेंडमेंट पर मैं बुलाऊंगी, ये अपनी बात पूरी कर लें तो मैं बुलाऊंगी।

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Naturally, once a facility is available, we all opt for that. Though we are not habituated to travel by the A.C. first class, when that facility is available, normally the tendency will be to go by that class and take the companion also in that class. The companion may be a peon. He may be an attendant or anybody else who is accompaning. sometimes even a security guard also. The very purpose is to give the facility to the Members, of course, spouses and also former Members. That being the case, the purpose should not be allowed to be defeated. As Mr. Pranab Mukherjee has said, let us examine this aspect. A comprehensive Bill is being brought before the House. The hon. Deputy Chairman has also rightly mentioned about the particular aspect of some Members who are not having spouses. That aspect also should be studied separately. But, now, let us go with this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not only about lady Members. Mr. Tohra, a Member of this House, came to me and told me that he had some problem because his right hand was hit by a terrorist's bullet. He cannot use it. So, he wanted special permission for a companion to travel with him because he is handicapped. The Government will have to find a way out where it is a case of a single Member or a handicapped Member. It will have to define a 'companion', who goes with a single Member in other capacities and an 'ordinary companion', who could be a Secretary, a Peon or a Security Guard. This has to be seen.

श्री लछमन सिंह: मैडम, यह जो तीसरे आदमी के लिए प्रोविजन रखा है, बिल्कुल डिसीट कर दिया जाए। सेकेंड ए.सी. में कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मैडम, 3 बरस में मैंने सिर्फ 2 हवाई यात्राएं की हैं जब कि हमें 32 मिलती हैं। पंजाब, हरियाणा और हिमाचल के लोग हवाई जहाज का सफर इस्तेमाल नहीं करते हैं। हम तो सिर्फ शताब्दी में जाते हैं-नई दिल्ली-चंडीगढ़ और नई दिल्ली-अमृतसर। तो यह सब बंद कर दीजिए। हम लोगों को कितनी फैसिलिटी हैं हवाई जहाज की है, ए.सी. फर्स्ट क्लास की है। हमें सिर्फ चाहिए फैसिलिटी शताब्दी के अंदर। उसमें कौन सा एकॉमोडेशन की शॉर्टेज है? हमें तो काफी सुविधाओं की जरूरत भी नहीं है। यह जो तीसरे आदमी के लिए व्यवस्था रखी है, वह फिजूल रखी है, उसको कैंसिल कर दीजिए। वे जो उधर बैठे थे आराम के साथ, उन्होंने अपने मतलब की बात कर ली। It is very bad. प्राईम-मिनिस्टर के स्वाउज नहीं है, ममता बनर्जी के नहीं है, वे क्या करेंगे? उनका क्या होगा उनकी बात आपने सोची नहीं है। जो वहां मीटिंग में बैठ गए हैं ये अपने मतलब की बात कर लेते हैं वहां जाकर।

उपसभापति: नाम मत लीजिए।

श्री लछमन सिंह: मैडम, मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि हरियाणा के अंदर 2 आदमी एम.एल.ए. के साथ फर्स्ट क्लास में जा सकते हैं। पंजाब के अंदर जा सकते हैं, यू. पी. के अंदर जा सकते हैं। यहां मल्होत्रा साहब ने कभी शॉर्टेज ऑफ एकॉमोडेशन नहीं देखी। कोई प्रॉब्लम नहीं है वहां पर। जो फैसिलिटी वहां पर एम.एल.ए. को है, एम. पी. को तो आधी भी नहीं है। हर एम.एल.ए. को पंजाब के अंदर नयी टाटा सूमो मिली हुई है, ड्राईवर है, 500 लीटर डीजल है महीने का। हरियाणा के अंदर भी देखिए आप 3-4 लाख रुपया कार लोन है, यहां केवल एक लाख है। यहां एम.पी. को मिलता क्या है? वैसे ही इसके पीछे झगड़ा किया हुआ है क्योंकि इनको सूट नहीं करता। इसलिए इसे बिल्कुल कैंसिल कर दीजिए। शताब्दी में सिवाय एम. पी. के कोई नहीं जा सकेगा, यह कर दीजिए, हमें मंजूर है। यह गलत है कि ए.सी. फर्स्ट क्लास में जाएंगे तो एक आदमी साथ ले जाएंगे। के लिए ले जाएंगे? क्यों रेल का नुकसान करते हैं? वह बिल्कुल निकाल दीजिए। सेकेंड क्लास में एक आदमी है, वह बिल्कुल नहीं होना चाहिए। ये ऐसा करते हैं और उसके अंदर अपने मतलब की बात कर लते हैं, यह तो बिल्कुल गलत है। मैडम, आप पिछला रिकॉर्ड निकलवाइए। खुराना साहब ने वायदा किया था कि हम अगले सैशन में अमेंडमेंट लाएंगे, वह बेचारे चले गए, अब वे यहां नहीं रहे तो यह हमारा कसूर है? वह अमेंडमेंट लाना था उन्होंने। Mr. Malhotra agreed with me hundred times. अब कहते हैं जगह नहीं है। यू.पी. के एम.एल.ए. को देखिए, साढ़े चार सौ एम.एल.ए. हैं। वे अपने साथ 2 आदमी ए.सी. फर्स्ट क्लास में ले जाते हैं।

उपसभापति: एम.एल.ए. की बात यहां नहीं करते हैं।

श्री लछमन सिंह : आप ऐनक्वायर कर लें, पंजाब के, हरियाणा के, सभी ले जा सकते हैं।

उपसभापति : अच्छा बैठिए लछमन सिंह जी। बैठ जाइए ना। कितनी बार आप बोलेंगे?

श्री लछमन सिंह : मैडम, हम होने नहीं देंगे। यह तो बड़ी गलत बात है।

उपसभापति : आपको बहुत बोलने दिया। अब बैठ जाइए। आप एम.एल.ए. से कंपेयर मत कीजिए। चीफ-मिनिस्टर को एम.एल.ए. को खुश रखना पड़ता होगा। यहां सब अलग मामला है। हम लोग पीपुल्स रिप्रैजैंटेटिवज़ हैं हम लोग खुद सोचते हैं कि हमको कितनी फैसिलिटीं मिलनी चाहिए, कितनी नहीं मिलनी चाहिए।?

श्री लछमन सिंह: आप हमारी प्रोटेक्टर हैं। आपको हमारी हिफाजत करनी है। आपके सामने फैसला हुआ था।

श्री रामजीलाल: मैडम, मैं अपने को इनके साथ एसोसिऐट करता हूं।

श्रीमती वीणा वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): मैडम, आपको ध्यान होगा और सदन को भी ध्यान होगा कि पिछले वर्ष जब सांसदों का सैलेरी बिल आया था और पास हो रहा था, उस समय सुविधाओं के बारे में बातचीत हुई थी और हमने अमेंडमेंट्स रखे थे कि जो सिंगल महिलाएं हैं, उन्हें जो फर्स्ट ए.सी. का रेलवे पास मिलता है, वे अपने आपको यात्रा करते समय सुरक्षित महसूस नहीं करती हैं। इस सिलसिले में उस समय कहा गया था कि जब स्पाऊज़ पास होगा, उस समय सोचा जाएगा और एक बिल लाया जाएगा और अगली बार दे दिया जाएगा। माननीय खुराना जी ने यह आश्वासन दिया था।

महोदया, आज जब दोबारा पेंशन और सैलेरीज़ का बिल आया है तो गंभीरता से इस बारे में सोचा जाना चाहिए। मैडम, खास तौर से जो सिंगल महिलाएं हैं, वे रात को यात्रा करते समय अपने को सुरक्षित महसूस नहीं करती हैं इसलिए उनके साथ कंपेनियन अवश्य होना चाहिए। वायु यात्रा में भी हम कंपेनियन ले जा सकते हैं लेकिन मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि कंपेनियन के लिए देने में रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री को क्या दिक्कत हो सकती है? इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि हम लोगों के लिए सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से सिंगल महिलाओं को, जहां स्पाऊज़ होता है, वहां सिंगल महिलाओं के लिए एक कंपेनियन देने की बात बिल में जोड़ी जाए।

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: मैं सिर्फ यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि इसमें कठिनाई वाली बात नहीं है और मेंबर्स कि यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक है कि फर्स्ट एयर में एक्जीक्युटिव क्लास में आप किसी भी कम्पेनियम को साथ ले जा सकते हैं और शताब्दी में एक्जीक्यूटिव क्लास में नहीं जा सकते। वह कम्पेनियन जो आपके साथ जाता है चाहे पिओन हो, चाहे बॉडी गार्ड हो, चाहे कोई भी हो या कंस्टीट्यूंसी का हो कोई भी आदमी हो और जब हम नम्बर को भी बढ़ा रहे है। रिलेशंस में कम्पेनियन के अलावा कितने भी रिलेशंस आप साथ ले जा सकते हैं और सब एक्जीकटिव क्लास में जाते है। अगर एक्जीकयूटिव क्लास में एयर में जा सकते हैं और शताब्दी में एक्जिकयूटिव क्लास में नहीं जा सकते और आप आगे बैठते है और उसको पीछे बिठाना पड़ता हैं और लगता है वह बहुत ऑड है इसलिए इस अमेंडमेंट को लाने की बात है और पिछली बार भी जब ....**(व्यवधान)**

डा॰ (श्रीमती) उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल: आप हमारी जरूरियात की भी बात करते हो, लेकिन हम तो ज्यादा फैमिली मेंबर्स चाहते ही नहीं हैं। लेकिन एक कम्पेनियन हो। ....**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All this discussion is outside the Bill. I have not yet allowed him to move the Bill.

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: मैं आप ही की बात का समर्थन करता हूं। मेंबर के साथ अगर एक कम्पेनियन साथ जाता है तो कोई आपत्ति की बात नहीं हैं यह होना ही चाहिए। परन्तु यह बात कैबिनेट में दोबारा जाएगी। एक मीटिंग के लिए हमने प्राईम मिनिस्टर से तय किया था पे एंड सेलेरी कमेटी में इन्ही चीजों पर बातचीत करने के लिए। मीटिंग तय भी हो गई थी, चेयरमेन दिल्ली से बाहर थे और वह आ नहीं सके। उसके बाद और बहुत सी बातें हैं जो पे एंड सेलेरी कमेटी ने की है जो इस बिल में नहीं है। वह इस हफते में बहुत सी चीजें उनके साथ तय हो पाएंगी। वह तय होने के बाद एक जम्पेनियन बिल कई और चीजों को मिला करके भी आने वाला है ....**(व्यवधान)** यह आपकी मरजी है।

डा॰ (श्रीमती) उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल: मैडम् .... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री रामजी लाल: फिर इसको बीच में रोक दिया जाए ....**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't behave like this. Don't make things look ugly. When everybody is agreeable on the

concern about women, I am also equally concerned. I am concerned with the problems of not only women, but also all single persons who need somebody to accompany them. Prof. Malhotra is concerned about it. Everybody is concerned about it. Now the question before the House is, I have not yet asked the Minister to formally move the motion. If you want to delay it, then, let the House and the Government take a decision.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Lok Sabha has already approved it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him move it. Then, we will have a way out.

THE MINISTER OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI): Madam Deputy Chairman, on behalf of my colleague I move:

That the Salary Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1999, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration.

Madam, I don't think there is any serious dispute about the objectives of this Bill. The Bill has already been approved by the Lok Sabha. I have heard a very interesting debate about the spouse and 'spice.' I am only adopting your terminology. I personally think that, over and above, the very strong argument that I have heard both from the hon. lady there and the hon. Member, Mr. Lachhman Singh, there is a more weighty argument, and the most weighty argument is that there ought not to be an embarrassing enquiry about the identities of the spouses and their "spices". Anybody who is more happy with his "spice" can always be so masquerading and you see they create problems. Therefore, I think, the practical solution is that we must allow companions and not allow the railways staff to make such enquiries which would be very inconvenient.

Therefore, Madam, I think on behalf of the Government we would accept suggestions of the hon. Member, Mr. Lachhman Sigh and the hon. Lady Member. Ultimately, even if it becomes necessary to go to the Lok Sabha again, probably, we will do it. But I don't think that would be necessary.

The question was proposed.

SHRI LACHHMAN SINGH: Thank you.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Madam, I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister — because the concerned Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not here — that it is only a replacement of an Ordinance. Am I correct? ..*(Interruptions)*... Let the Minister clarify.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I suggest both parts ..*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: We are in agreement with you. But, after all, when we are passing a legislation, we should also know what its effect is. If it is replacing an Ordinance, ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, I suggest that the Bill may be passed as approved by the Lok Sabha. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister give an assurance to the House. We have no problem. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Madam, it is said here in the Bill, "Notwithstanding such repeal, anything done or any action taken under the principal Act as amended by the said Ordinance, shall be deemed to have been done or taken under the corresponding provisions of the principal Act as amended by this Act. "Therefore, it is an Ordinance. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Madam, the Allahabad High Court has suggested ....*(Interruptions)*.... and nullified Members' passes. That has been promulgated through an Ordinance by the President. That is being ratified here. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The only solution is, the House should be satisifed with the assurance which we have given. Now, Madam, let us proceed with it. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, my suggestion is this. 'Spouse' is all right. In special cases, a special permit may be granted to the individuals by name when the hon. Member approaches the Speaker or the Chairman. And that special companion can always be permitted. He will become a permanent one.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Correct. It is a good suggestion. An identified person should be there to accompany.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Will it be permanent? Otherwise, it will go to the Chairman every time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Final, once. All the Members are now expected to have their families' combined photographs, together, to identify who the family members are, for CGHS purposes—my husband, my children and all that. They have to be there. In a similar way, it can be there. Special passes can be given. लखावत जी, अब इसमें क्या बोलना है? इतना तो सब बोल दिया आप ही बोल दीजिए।

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत (राजस्थान): महोदया, मुझे यह निवेदन करना था कि यह जो विधेयक आया है, इसका तो मैं समर्थन करता हूं परंतु एक निवेदन मुझे करना है कि यह विधेयक जब बना होगा तब शायद राज्य सभा विस्मृत हो गई होगी और इसलिए जब पेंशन का प्रोविज़न आया तो कह दिया कि राज्य सभा या लोक सभा में से दोनों सदनों का कोई सदस्य या लोक सभा में दो बार या कितने ही पीरियड के लिए रह गया होगा तो he will be entitled to pension. परंतु राज्य सभा के लिए सिमिलर क्लॉज़ नहीं। अगर वह केवल 6-6 महीने के लिए दोनों सदनों में या दो बार लोक सभा में रहेगा तो he will be entitled to pension. और राज्य सभा का मैम्बर कोई दो साल रह जाएगा तो he is not entitled to pension.

तो इसलिए मेरा बिनम्र निवेदन यह है कि अब एक विधेयक लाने की बात माननीय मल्होत्रा जी ने अभी कही है और यह आने वाला है तो इसमें इस बात को कंसिडर किया जाए कि मिनिमम पीरियड अनेक असेंबलीज़ में ऐसा है। एक बार अगर समाप्त हो गया है तो न्यूनतम इतना होगा ओर फिर उसके बाद एक साल रह गया, दो साल रह गया तो प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से बढ़ेगा। एक तो मुझे यह निवेदन करना था जिस पर विचार करना चाहिए। राज्य सभा का शायद इसमें ध्यान नहीं रहा, इसलिए मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं।

दूसरा निवेदन मुझे यह करना था कि आजकल हमको इंटरनेट की सुविधा की गई है। हमारे पास एक टेलीफोन है, वह उसके साथ लग गया है और इसलिए वह इंटरनेट से दो तीन घंटे चलता रहता है। इसलिए एक टेलीफोन और हो और उसकी जो कॉल्स है, फ्री कॉल्स, वह भी बढ़ाने के बारे में जब यह विधेयक बाद में आए, उस पर विचार किया जाए।

महोदया, एक निवेदन मेरा यह और था कि अनेक जगहो पर जो लोक सभा के माननीय सदस्य...मैं यह इसलिए कहना चाहता हूं कि....(व्यवधान)....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why should we have a running commentary? Please let him give his suggestion.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत: राज्य सभा के सदस्यों की कंस्टीट्यूएंसी पूरा राज्य होता है और प्रैक्टिकली संपूर्ण राज्य में जाना भी होता है। अनेक बार जाना होता है परंतु हम आपसे यह निवेदन करेंगे, वह आपसे ज्यादा जुड़ा हुआ प्रश्न है, वह इसलिए कि लोक सभा के सदस्यों को निश्चित रूप से टूअर करने के लिए गाड़ी उपलब्ध होती है सरकार की परंतु राज्य सभा के सदस्यों के लिए उपलब्ध नहीं होती है। इनको वे सांसद मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है इसलिए मेरा निवेदन यह है कि अनेक राज्यों में यह सुविधा नहीं है। हम यह चाहेंगे कि आप इसको राज्य सभा के सदस्यों के लिए दिलवाएं कि इसमें कम से कम किसी प्रकार का भेदभाव न हो।

आखिर में एक निवेदन मैं यह करना चाहूंगा कि वेतन के बारे में जब बहुत बिल आ रहा है तो उसके अंदर एक बात यह कही गई कि स्टेटस के नाते जो राज्य सभा के मेंम्बर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट होंगे, उनका प्रिंसिपल सेकटरी से एबव स्टेटस होगा। यह अभी बताया गया था परंतु मैं यह मानकर चलता हूं कि राजनीति में काम करते-करते व्यक्ति को इतना व्यस्त रहना पड़ता है कि वह और कार्य कितने कर लेगा अपनी जीविकोपार्जन के लिए, यह मुझे संभव इन दिनों नहीं लगता।

पिछले दिनों एक पूर्व सदस्य थे उनके समय में डेढ़ साल के पीरियड के अन्दर ही लोक सभा भंग हो गई। उनको पैंशन की व्यवस्था नहीं थी। उनके अंतिम दिनों की स्थिति हमने देखी है। उनके लिए फ्री मेडीकल की व्यवस्था है, उनके लिए सेकेंड टू टीयर ए.सी. में यात्रा करने की व्यवस्था है परन्तु उनके लिए 15 किलों या एक मन अनाज की व्यवस्था नहीं है। यह व्यवस्था भी होनी चाहिए। यदि उनके आखिरी दिनों के अन्दर कोई संतान नहीं है, या संतान ठीक से नहीं है या जीविकोपार्जन का कोई साधन नहीं है तो उन्हें बहुत परेशानी होती है। मेरा एक निवेदन है कि इन इंस्टीट्यूशन्स को लाइटली नहीं लेना चाहिए। यह नहीं है कि हम संसद में आ गए हैं तो हमारे सारे काम चार हजार रुपये की तनख्वाह में चल जाऐंगे। फिर ईमानदारी, नैतिकता और स्केण्डल्स में जांच की मांग का काम आजकल बहुत आसान हो गया है। हमारे कपड़े सफेद बने रहें और हमारा तथा हमारे वैयक्तिक परिवार का

जीवकोपार्जन तो उसके ठीक हो सके। इस नाते वेतन की पर्याप्त कोई न कोई व्यवस्था इस तरह की सोचकर के सामूहिक रूप से एवं उचित वेतन की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। वेतन की एक स्थाई व्यवस्था भी होनी चाहिए जिससे कि मूल्य सूचकांक बढ़ने पर बार-बार संसद में आने की आवश्यकता न पड़े। राज्य सभा का सेक्रेटिएट है, चेयरमैन साहब है, उपसभापति महोदया आप हैं और उधर से स्पीकर साहब हो सकते हैं। जिस प्रकार से मूल्य सूचकांक बढ़ता है उसी प्रकार से इसमें भी वृद्धि होनी चाहिए। इस नाते एक वृहत विधेयक आना चाहिए। यह कहते हुए जो अभी वर्तमान में विधेयक आया है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूं और इसका समर्थन करता हूं।

उपसभापति: लोक सभा का इसलिए जयादा जिक्र हुआ क्योंकि लोक सभा भंग हो जाती है और राज्या सभा भंग नहीं होती है। राज्य सभा में सिर्फएक समस्या होती है कि अगर कोई मेम्बर छोटे टर्म के लिए दो साल के लिए या चार साल के लिए आते हैं, उनके लिए प्रावीजन होना चाहिए। लोक सभा का इसलिए बार-बार जिक्र किया गया है क्योंकि देखा गया है कि डेढ़ साल के अन्दर ही, दो साल के अन्दर ही लोक सभा भंग हो चुकी है। राज्य सभा को कोई निगलेक्ट नहीं किया गया है। Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. *(Interruptions)*. He has got an amendment.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I have been listening very patiently to the other Members with the hope that they would be reciprocating my views, even if I say something which is contrary to what the other Members are saying; and I should be listened to. That is the privilege I am seeking from the other Members who may not agree with me. The first appeal to Shri Ram Jethmalaniji would be that he should really apply his mind to the whole question. The present provisions are not at all comprehensive. Jethmalaniji, I am addressing you. My feeling is that Jethmalaniji has not had the time to apply his mind to the Bill. He is busy with so many other things. Probably, this Bill did not get much attention from him. As a consequence, he has not gone into all kinds of gaps which are there in the Bill. Further, I would like to suggest to him that instead of instantly reacting to our suggestions..*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I am sorry to inform the hon. Member. You probably do not realise that I am not the Minister in charge of this Bill. I am only deputising for somebody. You are saying that I have not applied my mind.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is the collective responsibility of the Government which you are discharging.

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): He has volunteered himself.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I request Jethmalaniji not to react instantly to the suggestions which are coming from us because, for each suggestion, there are financial and other implications which should be gone into. Without going into those implications, may I request the hon. Minister not to respond to each and every suggestion? We are a big trade union and we should not be a very generous employer. You should be very cautious about how to conceal and how not to conceal. Jethmalaniji, being one of the best lawyers in our country, I would request him to apply his mind to all these issues. I am raising some very important issues. Some of them are legal and technical in nature. One problem has not been reflected in the Bill. We had a certain intention. But the legal department did not understand the intention and translated it into something which is asbolutely wrong. What was the intention? Our spouses, get two tickets per term for going and coming, from their agents. In all, in a year, they get six air tickets. I am not talking about the railway ticket. That is the idea. But the provision earlier was that these tickets will be linked to the term; for each term, two tickets. We wanted not to link it with the term. We said: "No, it should be for the whole year. It is for the spouse to decide as to whether she would come six times in one month or three times in two months. It is for her to decide. A total of six air tickets should be given to her. It is for her to decide how to fix her visits over the whole year. That is the idea. See what had happened. When this matter was sent to the Law Department, in order to give effect to that intention, they adopted a line, and the result of that is-let me announce it; it may not be known to all; spouses will be very happy, my wife also is very happy- it gives them an unlimited number of journeys. As far as spouses are concerned, within a period of fifteen days, they can travel as many times as they want. It is not so in the case of other members. That loophole has to be rectified. It

was certainly not the intention of the House, nor of the Standing Committee, but, by one mistake or the other, the Law Department has cooked up every thing and said that they have become too generous. That is the first point I wanted to raise. So, this should have been corrected before you came with this Bill. There are many acts of omission and commission. That should be corrected before a comprehensive Bill is brought before the House. This is not at all a comprehensive Bill.

Then, Madam, if you look at the wording of Clause 2 of the Bill, it is stated :

> "In the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in section 5—
>
> (i) in sub-section (2), for the Words "either alone or along with companion or spouse,", the words "either alone or along with spouse or any number of companions or relatives," shall be substituted."

What was the idea? The idea was this. Some of our Members are grandfathers. I am also a grandfather. They wanted to travel not only with their wives, but also with their companions or, may be, with five grand-children because when they travel separately, they may not be able to share their pleasure with their grandchildren. That is understandable. But how can it be with 'any number of companions or relatives'? You know railways operate on certain rules, aircraft operate on certain rules. How can you make it 'unlimited' or 'any number'? If I have 30 grandchildren, should I be allowed to travel with all those 30? So, There has to be a certain limit, subject to reservation requirements, management practices. I do not know what the requirement should be, but there should be certain safeguards so that this particular rule is not abused. This is ulimited. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: What is unlimited?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: "Any number of companions" can travel. ...(*Interruptions*)... Let me finish.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: We want you to enlighten us. We are not coming in the way.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You limit it up to 32. What it means is I can take 32 grandchildren with me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you have so many? Do you have 32 grandchildren?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I do't have. But this is the effect of the Law. What I am saying is this. The Law Ministry has not applied its mind. There should be safeguards to ensure that the Elders do not carry passengers who are not related to them. That should be corrected. This is another mistake which is there, which was of the intention of the House or of the Standing Committee. That should be corrected.

Then, I come to Clause 5 wherein it is stated:—

> "(i) In the second and third provisos, for the words "one thousand and four hundred rupees per mensum", the words "two thousand and five hundred rupees per mensum" shall respectively be deemed to have been substituted with effect from the 20th day of August, 1998."

I am not speaking about the particular figure of Rs. 2,500/-. I had made a concrete suggestion last time. I said that there had to be a rationale for fixation of our salaries. That rationale should be such that it should be independent of the Parliament, and it should be fixed based on an index. What I suggested was, let us find out what the salay of the Members of Parliament was in 1950, and on that basis, work it out. You take into account the cost of living index, you take into account the other indices, and then give a certain figure which should be relevant, which should be valid, which should be scientific and make it in Dependent of scrutiny by the Parliament. Some of them suggested that if you do that, it will be much more than this. Maybe, let us see. What is the difficulty? In the last few months, the Ministry had sufficient time to go thrugh the figures and find out what the figure in 1950 was. If you want, take some other earlier date. What I want to say is that there has to be a scientific basis because we are

fixing our own salary. The people of India should not feel that we are fixing our own salary generously. To make them understand that we are objective, and that we are not unnecessarily raising our salaries, there has to be a scientific basis. What I suggest is that, whatever salary was there in 1950, take it as the basis, then work out the increase, according to the cost of living index. Work out a certain figure for 1999 and, on that basis, fix the salary. After doing the indexing, if we find that the figure is high, we can discuss it, or, if the figure is low, we can discuss it. But this exercise has to be gone through. Unfortunately, neither the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs nor the Ministry of Home Affairs-two or three other Ministries are also involved-have done this exercise. What I say is that, in this Bill, there are hundreds of loopholes and leakages. The Ministry has not applied its mind to it. The Government has not applied its mind to it. And we should not be too generous to ourselves.

Lastly, I will make one point. We should not demean ourselves by comparing ourselves with the Principal Secretary, or this or that Secretary. Once you fix your salary, or, your perks, according to what is obtained by the Principal Secretary, then your rank will be that of the Principal Secretary, and nobody will respect you. So, don't make this comparison. We should not fix our salary according to what we need. We should not link it with the salary of a Civil Servant. We should also realise, when we are fixing. Such salary, that we are in politics. Some professionals, and Chartered Accountants have told me, now that I am in Parliament, I am suffering because my salary would have been Rs. 1 lakh, or, Rs. 2 lakh, but what I am getting here is nothing. That is absolutely right. But when you decide to choose politics, there is the concept of service. When I was a child, we used the Bengali word, *Deshe Seva*, that is, service for the nation. Nobody said, he is in politics. They said, he is doing *Deshe Seva*, that is, he is working for the country. We should not demean it; we should not always think in terms of what the salary of the Principal Secretary is, or, what the member of the Railway Board gets. Once you start making comparisons, people will lose respect for us.

Madam, the last point I want to make is that, ours is a very poor country. It is one of the 20 poorest countries in the world. In Asia, there are only five countries which are poorer than us. They are : Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Laos, etc. We should realise that our is a very poor country and whatever salary we talk about ...(*interruptions*). Please, I listened to you, now listen to me. Whatever salary we fix should have some comparison with the per capita income of our country. There should be some comparison as to what the average income of India is, and what should be the multiple of that income for Members of Parliament. That should be the basis, not what they give in America, or what they give in England. The perks given in different assemblies, or, the perks given to officers, should not be the basis for comparison. The only basis for comparison should be the average income of an Indian, and to what multiple of that, we are entitled. (*Interruptions*). Let us do the exercise. It is not that I give you a figure and you work out on that basis. Since we ourselves are fixing our salary, There should be no room for suspicion that we are doing this to help ourselves. Let there be an objective basis. Let this be in such a way that it goes above Parliamentary scrutiny so that, every year, we don't have to come back saying that we need more and so on. Once and for all, have a scientific basis and, on that basis ...(*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will tell you one thing. Very little time was given for it and you have taken more time than you should have. (*interruptions*). You please sit down. (*Interruptions*). One second. (*Interruptions*). No, no. (*Interruptions*). It should not look as if I am not permitting others to make a point. Whatever you wanted to say, you have said that. We have accepted your sentiments. (*Interruptions*). There are other Members also.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, there is another point. (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are others also.

DR BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I know, Madam. What I am saying is this. Others may not be deviating in general from what is there.

Another point which I am making is this. It is one thing to give an MP a computer which is very useful. It is one thing to give more flight passes 20, 30 or make it 40. It is one thing to give some postal expenses, franking. That is understandable. But it is quite another thing to give cash. When you give cash, you have to be very cautious. That is all.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody is giving cash.

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: कैश इन्होंने पार्टी को देना होता है। बाकी अपने पास रखते है। दैट इज द डिफरेंस और क्या है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Let us not confuse the whole thing. This legislation, which is before us, is very limited. As you have rightly said, we should not be very generous to ourselves. We should also see that we are not so miser to ourselves. We should be practical in our approach. Neither many privileges are good for anybody, nor are very few privileges. The computers are given to the Members of Parliament to function, to work and to improve their capacity. What Mr. Onkar Singh has said is absolutely right. The Members of Parliament are entitled to two telephones. One is for their office here. (*Interruptions*)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I support that, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not interrupt. It is a bad habit. It is not expected of a highly educated person. I have to put the record straight. What Mr. Onkar Singh has said is that there should be one telephone at the constituency and another at the Member's residence here. Now we are putting the entire Parliament, our Committees, our Bulletins, etc., on the website. If the Members want to have access to it, they need a telephone. It is a requirement. This was decided in the Computer Committee also. We had discussed this matter with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Communications and the other concerned people that the Members require an extra, dedicated telephone line for internet. This is not an extra largesse given to the Members. It is to enhance their capacity. If you are going to use your sole telephone here for your computer, you will not be accessible to your people who want to communicate with you. So, it is just to help the Members. Your suggestions are taken in good spirit. I think you are right that there should be some basis for fixing the salary of the Members of Parliament. It should not be linked to the salary of any other officer in service. What you say is absolutely right. Whatever is the inflationary rate from 1952 till today, it should be linked accordingly. If that is done, I think it will be in the correct spirit so that nobody can say that we have to come to the House again and again. We have come after a long time when a need was felt. It was felt that the Members' salary, which we had before, was a mockery. I am a Member of Parliament. I am paid differently. Do not think I am pleading for myself.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (GOA): Madam, last time when the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Madan Lal Khurana, came to this House it was suggested that it was not appropriate for us to debate and sit in judgement on our own salaries. I think it is again a question of jurisprudence. Therefore, I am not going into the details of this Bill. I would like to suggest that the Government should come forward with a mechanism and repeal this Act of 1954. Let there be a price index.

We should not sit in judgement and, as you have rightly said, give largesse because we are giving a wrong idea. Now there is a debate in the judiciary that though the money belongs to the people, it is a privilege of the Parliament. The judiciary is also debating in the Press that they should sit in judgement and increase their salaries. I do not think it will be appropriate for the Parliament to pass such a legislation where Members of Parliament are involved. I think there should be some price index or some other mechanism. I am not making any suggestions like the ATCs because they are demanding that they should get whatever their counterparts abroad are getting. I am not suggesting that we should get Rs. 1 lakh as received by the Members of Parliament in U.K. But there should be some mechanism; and I think this Bill should be repealed by this Parliament. We should not be embarrassed time and again because, after all if there is a debate in the public, that we are sitting in judgement

and giving a lot of facilities to ourselves. We are embarrassed. These are the facilities; these are the minimum requirements. There are Pay Commissions and Pay Commissions. Government of India does not come to the Parliament to say that this Pay Commission's recommendations have to ratified, and the officers who are now getting Rs. 8000 should be given Rs. 20,000. It is done through an executive order. So, let us follow some system, some precedence and I would request the Government to come with a legislation to repeal this Bill, repeal this Act of 1994, and not embarrass the Members of Parliament. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Last time also when we were discussing this legislation, Members had suggested and I had also suggested, that the hon. Speaker and the hon. Chairman of Houses can sit with the Committee and decide on certain principles. That would have been better; because after all, the Members of Parliament are under the jurisdiction of either the Speaker or the hon. Chairman and they are the appropriate authority to decide what privilege a Member of Parliament should have; the Government should not be involved in it. It becomes embarrassing for the Government to say 'No' to Members of Parliament and to say 'Yes' to Members of Parliament. Why should we put the Government in an embarrassing situation, and the Membes also. I would again tell the Minister, who is substituting, but he being a very good lawyer, can explain to the Government as to what are the sentiments of the members about it. Let this matter be left to the hon. Chairman and the Speaker, about all the facilities and privileges of Members of Parliament, so that the embarrassment is not there. Now, this discussion is over.

Mr. N. Thalavai Sundaram is not speaking. What he can add to it. He is a very law abiding Member. He abides by my ruling ...(*Interruptions*). Mr. Minister.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: There is really nothing to add except that I wish to assure the House and the hon. Members who have spoken, particularly, my very very dear friend—I heard him speak with great affection and with respect and I assure him—that we accept his philosophy and we endorse every word of him. It will be conveyed to the proper quarters and you will see that it finds a reflection in the comprehensive legislation. This is the assurance that I wish to give every Member of this House. But, Sir, I must suspect that he does not mind the results. He only wants it to be more properly and efficaciously argued before the people of the country ....(*Interruptions*).

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: In my case, I do not believe it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have some sense of humour. Nobody is attributing any motives on your part. We are appreciating it. You are a human being, you also have some need. Why should we overlook it?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: With this assurance, I move that the Bill be passed. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

> "That the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1999, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up Clause by Clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2, 3 and 4 were added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 5 — there is one amendment by Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. Are you moving?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, as I said earlier, there has to be a rational basis.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has agreed. ...(*Interruptions*). Mr. Biplab Dasputa, are you moving it?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I am moving it. I move:

"That at page 2, clause 5 be *deleted.*"

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then I will have to put it to vote.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I want it to be put to vote.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you are not accepting what we have said. What are you saying?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I have given one amendment. As I mentioned earlier, there has to be a rational objective basis. Secondly, in this Bill there are too many loopholes. If the hon. Minister gives a time-frame that within two or three months all the loopholes will be bridged, then it is okay: otherwise, I am not withdrawing it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, when I asked you to say a world on your amendment, you spoke very comprehensively. The Minister also reacted very positively. He has promised that they will be bringing a comprehensive legislation. I also made a comment from the Chair that there should be a certain basis on which the salary and allowances and provision of any other facility should be fixed. Mr. John Fernandes and the rest of the House agreed to it. Now if you still want to have your own say, I don't mind it. I am putting your amendment to vote.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, on the basis of the assurance given by you and by my friend, Shri Ram Jethmalani, I am not pressing my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't assure anybody. I only make a comment. How can I give an assurance? My suggestion is that the Government should bring a comprehensive legislation and also consider the views expressed by the Members of Parliament. I made only one comment, let the salary and allowances of the Members be considered by the Presiding Officers of both the Houses, i.e. the Speaker and the Chairman. Now it is for the Government to bring a legislation to that effect to repeal the original law. Then it will be for all of us to vote on it. I cannot give any assurance. I am not giving any assurance. I am only giving my support.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, I have already given the assurance.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Madam, I would like to add one more thing. At the same time, the Government should consider the mechanism as suggested by you that the salary an allowances of the Members should be decided by a body comprising the Speaker, the Chairman, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs — whatever may be the composition — and we should not be made to dwell on that. This should also be a part of the comprehensive legislation.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what I have suggested. All of you will agree with it because this is your view which I have articulated.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 and 7 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is now 5.45 p.m. We have before us the Companies (Amendment) Bill, 1999 and the Statutory Resolution. The Minister is here. If the House is ready to discuss it. ...(*Interruptions*). Let me take the sense of the House. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, what is your opinion?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There are fifteen minutes left to six. The Minister can move the Bill, mover of the Statutory Resolution can speak, and it can spill over to tomorrow.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Madam, it is not a question of 6 o'clock or 7o'clock. This is a most important Bill. But one cannot expect that we can have a fruitful discussion now. We have had several discussions today.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, you move the Motion and speak on it. इसको जिन्होंने अपोज किया है, उनमें बहुत ही कम लोग दिख रहे हैं मुझे यहां You can move it and we will get the Statutory Resolution moved tomorrow.